DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 107 710 95 TM 004 537

AUTHOR Womer, Frank B.; Lehmann, Irvin J.
TITLE 1973 Assessment Workshops: Final Report.
SPONS AGENCY Education Commission of the States, Denver, Colo. National Assessment of Educational Progress.; Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 15 Aug 73
GRANT OEG-0-9-08771-2468
NOTE 59p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$3.32 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Educational Accountability; Educational Administration; *Educational Assessment; Educational Needs; *Participant Satisfaction; Program Evaluation; *State Departments of Education; State Programs; Surveys; *Workshops

ABSTRACT

Three 3-day assessment workshops were held in Boulder, Colorado from June 19-29, for personnel in the assessment field from state departments of education. Seventy-six participants from 35 states, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands and the District of Columbia attended. Two of the three workshops concentrated on National Assessment as one model for large-scale assessments. Presentations were made by National staff members. The third workshop was held between the other two. The program for this workshop concentrated on seven different state assessments, a short up-dating on National Assessment, and small group discussion sessions. Presentations were made by state directors of assessment, contractors representatives, and selected National Assessment staff. Evaluations of the workshops were quite positive. In all three workshops over 90 percent of the responses indicated a desire to attend a follow-up workshop in 1974. Most questions elicited very favorable reactions. The major suggestions for improvement were for more discussion time and better speakers. The things liked best were the opportunity to interact with other assessment persons and to hear about other programs. (Author/DEP)

ED107710

FINAL REPORT

1973 ASSESSMENT WORKSHOPS

Frank B. Womer
Irvin J. Lehmann

Sponsored by the
National Assessment of Educational Progress
Education Commission of the States
Denver, Colorado

August 15, 1973

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED107710

FINAL REPORT

1973 ASSESSMENT WORKSHOPS

Prepared by
Frank B. Womer, Professor of Education
Bureau of State Services
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor
and
Irvin J. Lehmann, Professor of Evaluation Services
Michigan State University, East Lansing

Sponsored by the
National Assessment of Educational Progress
James A. Hazlett, Administrative Director
J. Stanley Ahmann, Staff Director

Education Commission of the States
Denver, Colorado
Wendell H. Pierce, Executive Director

This publication was prepared pursuant to Grant No. OEG-0-9-08771-2468 with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Grantees undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iv-v
INTRODUCTION	vi
WORKSHOP PURPOSES	1
WORKSHOP PLAN	3
WORKSHOP I SCHEDULE	5
WORKSHOP II SCHEDULE	7
WORKSHOP III SCHEDULE	10
EVALUATION OF WORKSHOP EXPERIENCES WORKSHOPS I AND III	12
EVALUATION OF WORKSHOP EXPERIENCES WORKSHOP II	29
WORKSHOP STAFF	37
WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS	39
EVALUATION FOR WORKSHOPS I AND III	45
EVALUATION FOR WORKSHOP II	47

ASSESSMENT WORKSHOPS

ABSTRACT

Three 3-day assessment workshops were held in Boulder, Colorado from June 19-29, for personnel in the assessment field from state departments of education. Seventy-six participants from 35 states, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands and the District of Columbia attended.

Two of the three workshops concentrated on National Assessment as one model for large-scale assessments. These were held at the beginning and the end of the nine days. These workshops were for personnel who had not attended a similar workshop in either 1971 or 1972. Presentations were made by National Assessment staff members. Attendance was 25 and 17.

The third workshop was held between the other two. Attendees were personnel who had attended a National Assessment workshop before, as well as any of the attendees at the other two workshops who cared to stay. The program for this workshop concentrated on seven different state assessments, a short up-dating on National Assessment, and small group discussion sessions. Presentations were made by state directors of assessment, contractors representatives, and selected National Assessment staff. Attendance was 53.

Evaluations of the workshops were quite positive. In all three workshops over 90 percent of the responses indicated a desire to attend a follow-up workshop in 1974. Most questions elicited very favorable reactions. The major suggestions for improvement were for more discussion time and better speakers. The things liked best were the opportunity to interact with other assessment persons and to hear about other programs.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The success of these three workshops was dependent in large measure on the various presenters and discussants. We were fortunate in having a goodly number of excellent presenters, both from the National Assessment staff and from various state departments of education and contracting agencies.

Those who presented various state assessment plans were Lorrie Shepard, California; Dale Carlson, California; Jim Fisher, Maryland; Roberta Keiter, Maryland; Jim Impara, Florida; Keith Cruse, Texas; John Adams, Minnesota; Gordon Ascher, New Jersey; and Dan Schooley, Michigan. Contractors' representatives were Dave Bayless, Research Triangle Institute; Bill Schabacker, Educational Testing Service; and Fred Finch, CTB/McGraw-Hill.

Three presenters on the topic of dissemination made major contributions, Louis Rubin, professor, University of Illinois; Erwin Bettinghaus, professor, Michigan State University; and Gerald Miller, professor, Michigan State University. The Cooperative Accountability Project (CAP) deserves thanks for providing the honoraria for Dr. Bettinghaus and Dr. Miller, who have just authored a new CAP publication on dissemination.

Within the National Assessment staff we are particularly indebted to Todd Rogers for his very lucid explanations and for the amount of time he gave us. Linda Mughrabi was invaluable in handling the myriad details of

conference operations. And Jack Schmidt, our National Assessment colleague in directing the workshop, must receive our special thanks for both his planning and operational skill.

It was a real pleasure to work with all of these professional colleagues.

Frank B. Womer

Irvin J. Lehmann

INTRODUCTION

This third series of assessment workshops was decided on almost at the conclusion of the 1972 workshops. It was obvious then that state directors of assessment and their staffs were anxious to continue the brief but well-established tradition of the workshops. A six-month follow-up confirmed that decision.

Initial plans called for two workshops, one to be devoted to National Assessment and one to state assessments. A mid-winter survey-of-interest demonstrated that the number of "new" participants would be too large to handle effectively in a single workshop. A decision was made to offer two identical National Assessment workshops, one before and one after the state assessment workshop for previous workshop participants.

Program development was related as much as possible to the evaluations received from attendees in 1972, within the usual constraints of staffing and time. A slight shift in local locale was necessary because of crowded conference conditions at the University of Colorado.

WORKSHOP PURPOSES

In the last two years the trend to state assessments has moved from a position of "interest" to a position of "implementation." At least a third of the states have gathered assessment data in one form or another and others are very close to that point. Almost all states are engaged in some phase of planning for or implementing an assessment.

In this climate it is imperative that information about large-scale assessments should be shared between and among the various states and the National Assessment project. A workshop to bring together the directors of assessment and members of their staff is a logical vehicle. National Assessment, as a nationwide project, is in a position of natural leadership to handle this need.

Previous workshops had concentrated on National Assessment as one model of assessment. For persons who had attended one of those workshops it was more logical to plan a program that would emphasize planning and activities within several states that are implementing assessment in a variety of ways. Any cursory examination of state plans shows one that, while no two are identical, there are certain common elements such as "use of released National Assessment exercises" by some, or "use of a regression model of analysis of results" by some, or "problems of reporting to lay publics" by others. Thus, one purpose of the 1973 workshops was to provide a sharing of state assessment plans.

A second major purpose of the workshops was to continue the activities of the previous two years, an indepth review of National Assessment policies and procedures, for interested state department personnel who had not attended a previous workshop. This was felt to be important for two reasons: (1) some states had not sent anyone to a previous workshop, and (2) many states had had changes in and/or additions to their assessment staff.

Clearly we are past the stage of deciding whether to do state

assessments or not. We are in a rapidly expanding period of implementation. The ultimate success of any of these programs, as well as the National Assessment project, will depend upon the quality of the program and the relevance of the results. A sharing of information among the states and National Assessment certainly is one essential ingredient for ultimate success.

WORKSHOP PLAN

The basic ingredients for program planning were: (1) previous experience in 1971 and 1972; (2) six-month evaluations of workshop participants in 1972; (3) a pre-registration of participants; and (4) knowledge of existing state assessment plans. In addition, the work of the Cooperative Accountability Project in contracting for monographs on dissemination of assessment results and developing large-scale assessments contributed to the planning.

Rather large pre-registrations for the National Assessment Model workshop led to a decision to split the group into two (hereafter called Workshop I and Workshop III). Identical programs were planned for the two groups (persons who had not participated in the similar workshops in 1971 or 1972). These workshops were condensed into 3-1/2 and 3 days respectively, by reducing the time devoted to certain topics, by eliminating specific discussions of state assessments,* and by utilizing evening sessions. While attendees did not divide themselves equally between Workshops I and III, the division did permit greater flexibility of discussions. Attendance was 25 and 17 respectively.

1973
Workshop Schedule

June	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30
					weekend							
Workshop I	X	X	X	X								
Workshop II							X	X	X			
Workshop III									X	X	X	X

*Attendees interested in specific state assessments were invited to attend Workshop II also.

Workshop II was planned to concentrate primarily on state assessment programs, except for one-half day devoted to "What's New" in National Assessment. One full day was scheduled for presentation and discussion of four topic areas of assessment, as each area is being handled in four different states -- Calfornia, Florida, Maryland, and Texas. Another day was planned to discuss how three different states used contracting agencies to handle a specific phase of their assessment program. The state-contractor combinations were Minnesota-Research Triangle Institute; New Jersey-Educational Testing Service; and Michigan-CTB/McGraw-Hill. A third day was planned in small group discussion sessions on topics chosen by conference participants, and individual consultation with National Assessment staff. Attendance at Workshop II was 53 (including 18 persons who also attended I or III).

Three outside speakers were engaged to discuss the general topic of dissemination of educational information. Drs. Gerald Miller and Erwin Bettinghaus, Professors of Communication at Michigan State University, spoke at Workshops I and III respectively. Dr. Louis Rubin, Professor at Large and Communications Specialist, University of Illinois, spoke at a conference dinner during Workshop II.

* * * *

The location of the workshop was at the Royal Inn, adjacent to the University of Colorado campus in Boulder, Colorado. Conference arrangements were made through the University, but meeting rooms were more convenient at the Inn. Some participants were housed in a University dormitory; others in the Royal and Holiday Inns. The University Club was used for the conference dinner.

WORKSHOP I SCHEDULE

June 19-22, 1973

June 19

1:00 - 3:00	Conference Registration
3:00 - 4:00	Introductory Remarks: Chairman Irv Lehmann
	Welcome: James Hazlett, Administrative Director, NAEP
	Why Assess?: Chairman Frank Womer
	NAEP Slide Show: Jack Schmidt, State Assessment
4:00 - 5:30	Developing Goals and Objectives: Hal Wilson

June 20

9:00 - 10:00 a.m.	Developing NAEP Objectives: Scott Newcomb
10:00 - 10:30	Break
10:30 - 12:00	Developing Assessment Questions, Items, Exercises: Hal Wilson
12:00 - 1:30 p.m.	Lunch
1:30 - 3:00	NAEP Exercise Development: Nancy Burton
3:00 - 3:30	Break
3:30 - 4:30	Principles of Sampling: Don Searls
7:00 - 9:00	NAEP Sampling: Todd Rogers

June 21

9:00 - 10:00 a.m.	Discussion of Sampling: Don Searls, Todd Rogers
10:00 - 10:30	Break
10:30 - 12:00	NAEP Data Collection and Scoring: Roger Talle, Sue Oldefendt
12:00 - 1:30 p.m.	Lunch
1:30 - 3:00	NAEP Data Analyses: Sue Sherman
3:00 - 3:30	Break
3:30 - 4:30	NAEP Data Analysis and Report Preparation: Charlie Gadway

June 22

9:00 - 10:30 a.m.	Discussion of Data Analysis and Report Preparation: Rex Brown
10:00 - 10:30	Break
10:30 - 12:00	Principles of Dissemination
	Introduction: Tom Fisher, Michigan Department of Education
	Presentation: "Dissemination of Assessment Information" - Gerald R. Milier, Professor, Michigan State University
	(this presentation sponsored jointly by NAEP/ Cooperative Accountability Project)
12:00 - 1:30 p.m.	Lunch
1:30 - 3:30	NAEP Utilization/Applications/Interpretation: Ken Seaman and U/A staff
	Discussion of Utilization/Applications/Interpretation
	Services Available from Utilization/Applications: Jack Schmidt and U/A staff
3:30 - 4:00	Break
4:00 - 4:30	Windup and Evaluation: Womer and Lehmann

WORKSHOP II SCHEDULE

June 25-27, 1973

June 25

Directors of Assessment from four different states, California, Texas, Florida and Maryland discussed alternative approaches to assessment in purposes and materials development, data collection, analysis and dissemination.

8:00 - 9:00 a.m.	Conference Registration
9:00 - 10:30	Purposes, Objectives, Exercise Development Chairman: Frank Womer
	Participants: California: Dale Carlson, Lorrie Shepard Florida: Jim Impara Maryland: Jim Fisher, Roberta Keiter Texas: Keith Cruse
10:30 - 11:00	Break
11:00 - 12:00	Sampling and Data Collection Chairman: Irv Lehmann
	Participants: Dale Carlson Lorrie Shepard Jim Impara Jim Fisher Roberta Keiter Keith Cruse
12:00 - 1:30	Lunch
1:30 - 2:45	Analysis and Report Writing Chairman: Irv Lehmann
	Participants: Dale Carlson Jim Impara Lorrie Shepard Jim Fisher Roberta Keiter Keith Cruse
2:45 - 3:15	Break

3:15 - 4:30	Interpretation/Dissemination/Utilization/ Applications Chairman: Frank Womer Participants: Dale Carlson Lorrie Shepard Jim Impara Jim Fisher Roberta Keiter Keith Cruse
6:00 - 9:00	National Assessment Dinner Chairman: Ken Seaman, Director of Utilization/Applications, NAEP Speaker: Louis Rubin, Communications Specialist, University of Illinois "Dissemination of Educational Performance Information"

June 26

9:00 - 10:30 a.m.	What's New at NAEP? (Objectives, Exercise Development, Sampling, Data Collection): George Johnson, Associate Staff Director, NAEP
10:30 - 11:00	Break
11:00 - 12:00	What's New at NAEP? (Analysis Reporting, Dissemination): George Johnson
12:00 - 1:30 p.m.	Lunch

Afternoon Sessions: A team from each of three states discussed one aspect of assessment in that state. Each team consisted of a State Director of Assessment and a representative from a contracting agency that worked with that state.

1:30 - 2:45	Development of a State Assessment Plan in Minnesota Chairman: Frank Womer Participants: John Adams, Minnesota Dave Bayless, Research Triangle Institute John Pyecha, Research Triangle Institute

2:45 - 3:15	Break
3:15 - 4:30	Development of Objectives and Exercises in New Jersey Chairman: Irv Lehmann Participants: Gordon Ascher, New Jersey William Schabacker, ETS
7:00 - 9:00	Development and Tryouts of Exercises in Michigan Chairman: Jack Schmidt, NAEP Participants: Dan Schooley, Michigan Fred Finch, CTB/McGraw-Hill

June 27

9:00 - 10:00 a.m.	Small Group Discussions on topics selected by conference participants
10:00 - 10:30	Break
10:30 - 11:30	Repeat of Small Group Discussions
11:30 - 12:00	Windup and Evaluation: Irv Lehmann
	(Optional)
2:30 - 4:00	Individual consultation at NAEP offices in Denver with NAEP staff

WORKSHOP III SCHEDULE

June 27-29, 1973

June 27

8:00 - 9:00 a.m.	Conference Registration
9:00 - 10:00	Introductory Remarks: Chairman Frank Womer
	Welcome: George Johnson, Associate Staff Director, NAEP
	Why Assess?: Chairman Frank Womer
	NAEP Slide Show: Jack Schmidt,
10:00 - 10:30	Break
10:30 - 11:30	Development of Goals and Objectives: Hal Wilson
11:30 - 1:00 p.m.	Lunch
1:00 - 2:30	Development of NAEP Objectives: Scott Newcomb
2:30 - 3:00	Break
3:00 - 4:30	Development of Assessment Questions, Items, Exercises: Hal Wilson
7:30 - 9:00	NAEP Exercise Development: Nancy Burton

June 28

8:30 - 9:30 a.m.	Principles of Sampling: Todd Rogers
9:30 - 10:00	Break
10:00 - 12:00	NAEP Sampling: Todd Rogers
12:00 - 1:30 p.m.	Lunch
1:15 - 2:45	NAEP Data Collection and Scoring: Roger Talle, Wayne Martin
2:45 - 3:00	Coffee
3:00 - 4:30	Principles of Data Analysis and Technical Report Preparations: Ina Mullis, Dave Wright
4:30 - 5:30	NAEP Data Analysis and Report Preparation: Rex Brown

June 29

9:00 - 10:30 a.m.	Principles of Dissemination
	Introduction: Dan Schooley, Michigan Department of Education
	Presentation: "Dissemination of Assessment Information" - Erwin P. Bettinghaus, Professor, Michigan State University
	(this presentation sponsored jointly by NAEP/ Cooperative Accountability Project)
10:30 - 11:00	Break
11:00 - 12:00	Discussion of Principles of Dissemination: Bettinghaus
12:00 - 1:30 p.m.	Lunch
1:30 - 3:30	NAEP Utilization/Applications Interpretation Jack Schmidt and U/A staff
3:30 - 4:00	Coffee
4:00 - 4:30	Windup and Evaluation: Womer and Lehmann

EVALUATION OF WORKSHOP EXPERIENCES

WORKSHOPS I AND III

On the final day of the workshop, the participants were asked to complete an evaluation form. The purpose of this evaluation was two-fold: (1) to provide the workshop staff with some objective evidence concerning the impact of the workshop experience on the participants, and (2) to provide the workshop staff with feedback that could be of value in the planning and conduct of future workshops.

The major questions asked in the evaluation form for Workshops I and III were as follows. The evaluation of Workshop II is covered separately in the following section of this report.

1. Relative value of major presentation sessions.
2. General impressions of the workshop experience.
3. Length of workshops.
4. Suggested improvements for future workshops.
5. Most and least valuable workshop experience.
6. Degree of satisfaction with workshop experience.
7. Suggested improvements.

Twenty-seven participants were registered for Workshop I. Of these, two only attended one or two sessions and therefore were not considered in determining the population size. Of the 25 eligible respondents, completed evaluation forms were received from 24 participants (96 percent). The results are based on the replies received from these 24 participants. Seventeen participants were registered for Workshop III. Of these, one participant attended about one-half the workshop and two attended only one day. The former was included but not the latter. Responses were received from all the participants.

In a few instances, the total number of responses to a particular question will be less than the base number of participants because of failure to respond to that question by one or more persons.

Relative Value of Major Presentation Sessions

One of the more difficult aspects in the planning of any learning experience is to offer experiences that will be most beneficial to a majority of the learners. Planning a workshop is no different. On the basis of evaluations conducted with previous workshop participants, the directors planned and organized a series of speakers and topics within the constraints that the general topic was National Assessment and that most speakers would be from the NAEP staff.

The participants were asked to rank, in order of importance, the eight major presentation sessions in relation to their present and possible future work. Using a weighting scheme where 1 = the activity ranked first, the mean ratings and rank order are presented below.

Session	Mean Rating		Rank Order	
	WS I	WS III	WS I	WS III
Developing objectives	2.5	3.4	1	2
Sampling	4.5	2.0	5	1
Scoring	5.1	5.7	8	8
Report preparation	4.7	4.9	7	4
Exercise development	3.4	5.1	2	5
Data collection	4.8	5.2	6	6
Data analysis	4.0	5.4	3.5	7
Dissemination	4.0	4.1	3.5	3

It is evident from the results that there are both similarities and differences between the participants in the two workshops in their ratings of the various content sessions. For example, participants in both workshops rated developing objectives and dissemination in the top three; and rated scoring of least value. In contrast, whereas the Workshop III participants felt that the sampling session was of most value to them, this was not true for Workshop I participants, who ranked sampling fifth. Workshop I participants ranked exercise development second, whereas it was fifth for Workshop III.

Although there may be marked differences in the rank order of a particular session (for example, report preparation) there is little or no difference in the mean rating between some of them. This is an artifact of the ranking procedure and suggests that one should look both at the mean rating and rank order before drawing any conclusions, especially where there is a marked discrepancy in rank order.

There is no denying the fact that there is a marked difference between the participants in the two workshops insofar as the sampling and the exercise development are concerned. This may be due, in part, to the differences between the participants in terms of training, experience, and job responsibilities. Also it might be explained in part by differences in the speakers and format employed in the two workshops. Whereas Workshop I used a team approach for sampling, only a single presenter was used in Workshop III. On the other hand, speakers were identical for exercise development in both workshops.

It may be of interest to note that two of the participants did not answer the question, but said "all topics are of great importance in the planning and implementation of an assessment program." Informal comments could lead one to feel that this sentiment was shared by other participants, even though they answered the question.

Another point of interest is the greater homogeneity of responses for Workshop I. The mean ratings went from 2.5 to 5.1, a difference of only 2.6 ranks. For Workshop III, however, the mean ratings went from 2.0 to 5.7, a difference of 3.7 ranks. This may have been due to a leveling effect introduced by a larger group of raters, or the interests within Workshop I may have been more heterogeneous (resulting in less differentiation when rankings were averaged).

In Workshop I, developing objectives and exercise development were clearly of greatest intent, whereas no one topic was clearly of least interest. In Workshop III sampling and developing objectives were of greatest interest and scoring of least interest.

General Impressions of Workshop Experience

The reactions from the two workshops are so divergent that it does not seem appropriate to discuss them collectively. Rather, the data are presented separately, with an attempt to interpret the variability in results. The data from this question are presented below.

Area	Workshop I			Workshop III		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor
Overall workshop organization	14	8	2	8	7	0
Workshop content	11	10	2	9	6	0
Speakers/discussion leaders	9	13	1	9	6	0
Workshop materials	17	7	0	10	5	0
Living facilities	20	2	1	9	3	2
Opportunity for group discussion	9	8	7	12	3	0
Opportunity for individual interaction	11	10	3	12	3	0
Availability of workshop co-directors	17	6	0	13	2	0

The major differences between Workshops I and III were in terms of: (1) the time frame (Workshop I was conducted in 3-1/2 days; Workshop III in 3 days); (2) some presenters; and (3) the size of the groups.

The most positive reactions (positive in the sense that 70 percent or more of the participants rated the question "good") for the Workshop I participants were living facilities (83%), availability of co-directors (74%), and workshop materials (71%). In contrast, "goodness" reactions for the Workshop III participants were availability of co-directors (87%), opportunity for discussion (80%), opportunity for individual interaction (80%). Thus, three of the eight questions suggested considerable satisfaction in each workshop. However, only one question -- availability of co-directors -- received this level of satisfaction from the participants of both workshops. Slightly more than one-half of the participants -- 58% and 53% in Workshops I and III respectively rated overall workshop organization as "good."

The Workshop I participants were more negative in their reactions in comparison to their counterparts in Workshop III. For example, the only question that received any "poor" ratings from Workshop III participants was living facilities (two out of fourteen, or 14 percent).

For Workshop I six of the questions elicited at least one "poor" response, out of 24 respondents. But for only two of these six questions was the percentage greater than 10 percent of the respondents (3 or more). For "opportunity for individual interaction" there were 12 percent "poor" ratings, and for "opportunity for group discussion" there were 29 percent "poor" ratings. This is very understandable when one considers the size of the two workshops: Workshop I at one time had 27 participants whereas Workshop III at one time had a maximum of 17 participants. Also, the fact that the participants were housed in different locations (more of the Workshop III people lived in the same place), might explain some of the findings.

It is interesting to note, however, that of a total of 16 "poor" responses from Workshop I, 9 of them came from three respondents. This suggests that Workshop I may not have met the needs of three of the participants too well.

The matter of group dynamics must also be considered when attempting to interpret the markedly different results to the question on opportunity for group discussion. The memory of the directors suggests that roughly comparable amounts of time were spent in group discussion in Workshop I and Workshop III. But it is possible that a more limited number of the participants in Workshop I actually engaged in discussion and raised questions, and that others, perhaps not by choice, were precluded from doing so because a few used up the available time. Or, it is possible that the sheer size of the group and the tight scheduling prevented everyone from being able to participate in the discussion. These reactions suggest that the size of future introductory workshops be seriously considered by the staff.

The question on quality of speakers/discussion leaders received more "average" ratings than "good" ratings in Workshop I. Certainly the speakers at the workshops differed markedly in their teaching ability and if one had to select a single reaction that was voiced most frequently, it centered about the quality of the speakers. Specific comments were made by six Workshop I participants and by three Workshop III participants. It is difficult to control this problem completely, because not all researchers are automatically good "teachers." Certainly efforts should be made to exercise some greater control in the future.

Comments made by more than one participant in Workshop I were as follows:

> "More careful culling of speakers... some are very knowledgeable but poor speakers" (6)
>
> "Better coordination among speakers" (3)
>
> "Co-directors were attentive to the group's needs" (2)
>
> "Too lecture-oriented--not a workshop" (2)
>
> "NAEP people tended to speak to each other rather than answer the participants' questions" (3)

The other comments, made by only a single participant, were concerned with such things as physical facilities, the technical nature of the content, living facilities, and the like.

The only comment made by more than one person in Workshop III was related to the quality of the speakers used (3). The other comments, made only once, dealt again with physical facilities, evening sessions, and the technical nature of some of the material.

In summary, it would appear that the majority of the participants in both Workshops I and III had positive reactions and felt that most of the experiences offered would be or are of value to them. The staff are concerned about the average and negative comments related to the speakers and opportunity for discussion and will take them into consideration in future planning.

Length of Workshop

On the basis of remarks made at the workshops in 1971 and 1972, and because of time constraints for some of the NAEP staff who were serving as speakers and resource personnel, it was decided to reduce the length of the workshops from five to three and one-half days and to three days. This was done without omitting any of the essentials about National Assessment covered in previous workshops but by removing one day on state assessments. This did result in long days and some evening sessions. The participants were asked for their reaction to this condensation and the results were as follows:

1. Nineteen participants in Workshop I and 10 participants in Workshop III stated it was satisfactory;
2. Two participants in Workshop III said that the material should have been spread over more days; and,
3. Four participants in Workshop I and one participant in Workshop III said that less material should be covered in the same number of days.

Initially, the co-directors were concerned that the participants would be "worked" too much considering the length of the day sessions and the evening sessions. It would appear that the majority of the participants -- 76 percent and 77 percent in Workshops I and III respectively -- felt that they were not being pushed. However, some of the comments made on the evaluation sheet such as "too scheduled-missed opportunity to interact," "avoid night meetings," "although much material was covered in a short time, to reduce the amount of time would be undesirable and to increase the time too much would be impractical," suggest that some consideration be given to the question of workshop length another year. If it would be considered desirous to permit more group interaction and group discussion, it would appear that the length of the workshop would need to be increased or the enrollment limited to about 15 to 20.

Four of the Workshop I and six of the Workshop III participants made specific comments. Three of the former and one of the latter group said that the sessions were too long and that evening sessions following a very full day are almost too much. One Workshop III participant said that "some of the material was repetitious... some could be condensed further... emphasis could be shifted."

Most and Least Valuable Workshop Experience

As would be expected with a diversity in the training, experience, and job responsibilities of the workshop participants, those experiences most valuable to some would be less valuable to others. In fact, it would appear that a common frame of reference is the nature of one's job responsibility. As some participants stated, "sessions on....., because the concerns discussed were more directly related to my present tasks."

The most common comments made as "most valuable" experiences were that the workshop provided them with an opportunity: (1) to meet with others who had similar problems; (2) to hear about National Assessment and thereby develop a better understanding of that model and see how it could fit (either directly, partially, or completely) into their own state assessment plans; and (3) to discuss points of mutual concern. Possibly the following comment succinctly portrays the feeling expressed by a majority of the participants: "The real strength of this first week in my opinion is the quality of informed personnel whom I have had the good fortune to meet and whom I consequently will pursue to provide professional assistance as necessary." This feeling is one that has been present in all the workshops and it is evident that further contacts are being made between the various state assessment personnel attending the workshop. On more than one occasion the directors have heard about participants calling each other to discuss problems or to offer suggestions.

Specific comments that were made were as follows:

> "Discussion of the development of objectives and exercises. These two activities are necessary in any assessment program" (6)

"Meeting NAEP staff and the opportunity to interact with people from other states" (6)

"Familiarization with NAEP" (5)

"Learning about pitfalls one falls into in an assessment program and alternative actions" (4)

"Sampling and dissemination sessions were excellent" (4)

"Knowing what's going on in other SDE's" (4)

"Learning about NAEP sampling techniques" (3)

"Principles of dissemination by Miller" (3)

Two other comments accurately portray the consensus of feeling of the majority of the participants regardless of which workshop they attended. They are:

"Sharing of ideas among participants. Each one now has the opportunity to improve what he has been doing in his particular state."

"It has enabled me to make a much more accurate assessment of the potential value and feasibility of adapting parts of the NAEP model for state assessment in _____ and the care with which such decisions must be approached. The opportunity to exchange ideas and information and the understanding of NAEP (which was the objective) were the most valuable aspects of the workshop."

It is interesting to note that over 20 percent of the Workshop I participants commented that the most valuable experience was learning about NAEP whereas none of the Workshop III participants mentioned this.

* * * *

The least liked portion of the program by the participants in both workshops were the sessions on report preparation (10 persons). However, judging from the various comments made on the evaluation form as well as from those garnered from informal discussions, it would appear that this may have been due to the manner in which the material was presented and the fact that some presenters were not very dynamic. Next in order of "least" liked were the sessions on sampling. Six respondents indicated

sampling, all of them from Workshop I. Three persons from Workshop I felt that "repetition of information already known" was least liked, and three indicated that the "speakers" were least liked. Two persons in Workshop I wrote in "data collection." From Workshop III no response was greater than one, except "report preparation." And three participants in Workshop III said that everything was of value. Some of the individual comments made by the Workshop III participants are:

> "Friday PM session--too much on NAEP problems."
>
> "Exercise Development"
>
> "Utilization/Application"
>
> "Report writing--insufficient detail. Maybe optional examples should be discussed."

The participants in Workshop I had more to say on this question than their counterparts in Workshop III. The six persons who indicated sampling as least liked in Workshop I indicated that it was because of the technical nature of the material. These participants expressed a desire for a less-technical presentation, and would rather have had a survey of sampling presented than a discussion of how a particular sample is selected. One reaction was "...the sampling discussion (which was too quick, too complicated), although it was directed by the most dynamic speaker."

Inasmuch as some of the sessions that were least liked were technical and some were of a non-technical nature, one might conclude that the least liked feelings are related either to specific content or to the presenters -- their organization, content, presentation, and the like. Other individual comments made as "least liked" were as follows:

> "General lecture attitude"
>
> "Failure to elaborate on points"
>
> "Time precluded questions and discussion"

In the main, the majority of participants had more "most" than "least" comments about their workshop experience. Three of the

participants in Workshop III and two persons in Workshop I said that all the sessions were good and valuable.

The least liked reactions related primarily to the presenters and to the technical nature of some of the material. In addition, some of the "least" comments were related to "lack of the respondent's responsibility for or contact with this activity."

The reactions to the questions about most and least liked portions of the program suggest that state department assessment personnel want to know more about what's going on in other assessment programs and want to have the opportunity to meet and discuss problems of mutual concern. In a sense, the workshop serves as a cathartic agent and helps to give confidence to those who are working in a very difficult area.

Degree of Satisfaction with Workshop Experience

There were three specific questions asked in order to provide objective evidence regarding the future of the workshop. One of these was "Would you recommend the workshop for other State Department personnel?" Another was "Would you recommend this workshop for local education agencies (LEA's)?" A third question was "Would you be interested in attending a follow-up workshop next summer?" The responses to these three questions were:

	Number of Participants Responding					
	Workshop I			Workshop III		
Question	Yes	No	?	Yes	No	?
Recommendation for other State Department Personnel	19	4	1	13	1	1
Recommendation for LEA's	13	10	1	2	7	4
Attend follow-up workshop	20	1	3	12	2	1

Over 80 percent of the participants in both workshops (83 percent and 86 percent in Workshop I and III) indicated that they would recommend this type of workshop to their colleagues in the state department. The

reasons most often given were:

> "It would provide them with a better understanding of assessment" (6);
>
> "These people would benefit greatly from a basic orientation to NAEP and thereby might avoid some of the problems NAEP encountered" (5);
>
> "Need to know what's going on" (3);
>
> "Exchange of ideas" (2);
>
> "It would help facilitate communication among staff" (2).

A comment echoed by many of the participants was "particularly for 'non-assessment' oriented staff who are important to an overall effort but who do not know the why or wherefor of assessment (and program planning)." Another comment made by some of the participants either explicitly on the questionnaire or in informal discussions was "no matter how much we caution people about rushing into state assessment without adeqaute and careful planning, they don't believe us. There are those among us who want to collect data tomorrow -- they need to hear first-hand of the problems involved."

For the five participants who answered in the negative, the consensus was that unless the person is actually involved in a program, he need only have a superficial knowledge and understanding which could be obtained from existing documents. One participant felt that the material is too sophisticated for most state education agency (SEA) personnel and felt that a less technical information session for the generalist, curriculum specialists, and department managers would be most helpful.

* * * *

There was considerable variation between the two groups insofar as recommending the workshop to LEA's. Slightly more than one-half (54 percent) of Workshop I people but only 13 percent of Workshop III participants answered in the affirmative. And there were more participants in Workshop III (four persons versus one person) who indicated uncertainty.

Why such a marked difference? The written comments do not contain an explanation. Of these who said they would recommend a NAEP workshop for LEA's, the only comment made by more than one person was "It would broaden their perspective on assessment and help to break down fear" (three persons). The reasons given by the participants who said "no" to the idea of a NAEP workshop for LEA's said such things as:

> "The NAEP approach is not applicable to LEA's";
>
> "Only good for large LEA's";
>
> "Such sessions should be offered by the SEA to give it a state flavor and gear it more to their policy system."

Some of those who responded "no" did comment that there is the need for a workshop dealing with basic questions and issues where utility should be the first consideration.

Considering the fact that the workshop was not organized for LEA's the response may be more positive than one had a right to expect. In fact, had the responses been too positive one might make a case that the workshop organized for state department personnel left something to be desired. What is evident is that, as presently constituted and conducted, this workshop is designed specifically for those persons involved in state assessment programs or for the very large LEA's.

* * * *

Possibly the best indicator of the success of the workshop can be found in looking at the number of participants who indicated that they would like to return for a follow-up workshop. Collectively, 39 participants (82 percent) said they would be interested in attending a follow-up workshop next summer; 3 participants (6 percent) said no; and 4 participants (8 percent) said perhaps. When the results are broken down by workshop, the percentage differences are minor.

Suggested Improvements

Although there were open-ended sections following various questions, where the respondents could offer suggestions for improving future workshops, there were two questions specifically designed to do this. They differed slightly in their orientation. One question called for improvements for future meetings whereas the other was entitled final comments, and the respondents were told to offer suggestions for similar and different types of workshops. Since the questions are getting at essentially the same thing -- that is, how to improve on the present model -- the responses will be considered together. Many of the suggestions were common to the participants, regardless of the workshop they attended: (1) select the speakers with greater care (eleven responses); (2) avoid evening sessions (two responses); (3) try to have more free time built into the program so that people can collect their thoughts and converse with others (three responses); (4) try to house people in a central location to make interaction more feasible (two responses); (5) keep the workshop size small to permit discussion and interaction (two responses); and (6) spend more time looking at issues, the "why's," the relationship of the results to the improvement of education, and alternative approaches to the NAEP model (three responses). In addition, there were suggestions common to both groups that concerned themselves with physical facilities of the meeting rooms, coffee breaks, and the like which although valuable will not be discussed at this time. These additional points, however, will be considered by the co-directors in planning future workshops.

Three respondents suggested that each speaker prepare a brief outline which is distributed either at the beginning of the workshop or mailed to the participants before the workshop. This might eliminate premature questions and discussion as well as focus the participant's thoughts, if the materials were read prior to attendance.

Three or four individuals suggested that the total group be broken down into smaller groups, each of which would, in an actual working

situation, carry through a simulated assessment program from the beginning of identifying objectives to the preparation of a final report. Another type of stratification suggested was on the basis of interest areas. Still another type of grouping that was suggested was that there be a few major topical sessions where all participants would be present and then a series of small groups where selected areas would be considered in more depth. These comments suggest that some of the participants would like to attend a "working-through simulated set of experiences" type workshop rather than having the material presented to them in either a lecture or discussion medium. It should be noted that an attempt something along these lines was tried in a previous workshop; but the participants were not too pleased, feeling that they might have missed something by being in one group rather than another.

Two people asked whether it would be possible to have a 1-1/2 day information-type session showing NAEP products and discussing NAEP's future plans. Two participants commented upon the marathon-speed in which the workshops were conducted, stating that at times the audience missed some important material either because of the tempo and/or because they were tired. Six participants commended the co-directors and staff on their presentation of an excellent workshop.

One participant said, "Though I may have sounded negative at times, I felt good about the workshop and I felt it was worthwhile." Other comments were "the workshop has been worthwhile...it was well organized"; "the program content was most appropriate"; and "the directors set a pleasant atmosphere for an open conference which encouraged discussion."

In summary, it is evident that the majority of the participants in both Workshops I and III were satisfied with their experience.

Conclusions and Recommendations

On the basis of the workshop evaluation, as well as from informal discussions with the participants, it is evident that Workshop I and III

were quite successful. It would appear that most of the participants were pleased with the overall structure, content, materials, facilities, and opportunity for individual interaction. However, about a third of Workshop I were dissatisfied with the opportunity given them to engage in group discussion, and many felt that the speakers were average.

Many of the participants stated that as a result of attending the workshop, they developed a better understanding of National Assessment in general, and their local plans in particular. Many stated that they were able to meet their colleagues from other states and discuss similarities, differences, problems, solutions, and the like to a common goal -- that of undertaking a state assessment. This, of course, was a major purpose of the workshop. It was not the purpose of the workshop to promote a particular assessment model (the National Assessment model). But, it was the intent to give participants a detailed view of National Assessment so that they could use the information in developing their own assessment plans. In this way, hopefully, future state and local assessments can profit by National Assessment experiences, and avoid some of the problems experienced by NAEP. As one previous workshop participant stated, "there is no reason to re-invent the wheel when it may only require some slight modification."

Based upon the various responses made on both the questionnaire and in informal discussion, we offer the following recommendations:

1. National Assessment should sponsor another workshop for new personnel in state departments undertaking or contemplating conduct of an assessment program.

2. Although three-fourths of the respondents indicated satisfaction with the amount of time for the workshop (three days) the specific suggestions for more discussion (Workshop I), the concern about evening sessions, and a potential desire for program differentiation suggest that serious consideration should be given to the time needed for this workshop. The six-month follow-up survey should include questions that seek more information on this point.

3. Consideration should be given to reorganizing the overall workshop so that all participants need not all attend the same sessions. Some participants commented that some of the sessions were too elementary or that they were already familiar with the material or that they had no interest or responsibility in that area. Possibly the general discussions of NAEP methodology should be reduced and participants be given more time to pursue their own specific interests.

4. The maximum size for a workshop like these two should be 15-20. A large meeting begins to resemble a conference, and lessens the opportunities for participant interaction.

5. If pre-registration indicates an enrollment larger than 20 the total group should be broken down according to their familiarity with the NAEP model. A person just appointed to head an assessment program might or might not be very knowledgeable about assessment in general and the NAEP model in particular.

6. More careful attention should be paid to the selection and preparation of speakers. There were instances where knowledgeable speakers were ineffective "teachers." Outside consultants should be used when it is known that they are stimulating teachers and also have the appropriate skills.

7. An attempt should be made to cater to some of the needs of particular states but not at the expense of the overall philosophy in which these workshops are conceived and conducted.

8. The 1974 meeting should place more emphasis on discussing the manner in which the data are disseminated and development of objectives.

9. The 1974 meeting should include more "discussion" sessions, with time being made available for such sessions.

10. National Assessment should sponsor a follow-up assessment meeting in 1974 for persons who attended these two workshops. The majority of the participants in both Workshops I and III indicated that they would be interested in returning next summer for a follow-up meeting. This relates to a suggestion for the continuation of the Workshop II approach (see recommendations after the next section).

EVALUATION OF WORKSHOP EXPERIENCES

WORKSHOP II

Workshop II was designed for persons who were already familiar with National Assessment. The program concentrated primarily on state assessments.

While 53 persons attended one or more sessions, only 44 were in attendance for the entire session. Of these, 40 responses to the evaluations were received. In a few instances the total number of responses to a particular question will be less than 40 because of failure to respond to that question by one or two persons.

Reactions to Conference Structure

The results for the first question are:

	Good	Average	Poor	?
1. Overall workshop organization	36	4	0	
2. Workshop content	31	9	0	
3. Speakers	17	23	0	
4. Workshop materials	26	12	1	
5. Living facilities	31	6	0	
6. Opportunity to interact individually with other conference participants	29	9	2	
7. Availability of NAEP staff	30	6	1	
8. Availability of workshop co-directors	35	4	0	1

These results showed that about 90 percent of the respondents felt that the overall organization was good, as was the availability of the workshop co-directors. About 75 percent rated the following categories "good": (1) workshop content; (2) living facilities; (3) opportunity to interact; and (4) availability of NAEP staff. Thus, six of the eight questions indicated considerable satisfaction with the workshop.

Workshop materials were felt to be good by two-thirds of the respondents. This is positive, but may suggest that some thought should be given to improvement another year.

The only response that was rated less than good by a majority of the respondents was the question on speakers -- 58 percent responded "average"; 42 percent responded "good." This clearly needs some attention for next year. Some effort needs to be made to improve the quality of presenting material. Since not everyone is really accomplished at "teaching" this may be difficult to change. And since many of the presenters were chosen because of their position in a particular program, it may be difficult to change. However, greater efforts could be made to encourage speakers to prepare themselves thoroughly, to have handouts and/or satisfactory audio-visual materials, etc.

Some respondents make comments after these questions. Those made by more than one respondent are as follows:

4	Best workshop ever attended
4	Good state assessment programs
3	Poor opportunity to interact
3	All participants should be housed together
3	Too much scheduled

* * * * *

Reactions to Specific Sessions

The responses to the next question are given below:

	Good	Average	Poor	?
1. (California, Florida, Maryland, Texas)				
1.1 Purposes, objectives, exercises	22	12	2	2
1.2 Sampling & data collection	21	14	1	2
1.3 Analysis and report writing	19	16	1	2
1.4 Dissemination	21	16	0	2

	Good	Average	Poor	?
2. NAEP dinner program	17	16	1	0
3. What's New at NAEP	6	15	17	0
4. Minnesota assessment	23	14	2	0
5. New Jersey assessment	26	8	0	2
6. Michigan assessment	22	11	2	0
7. Small group discussions	20	9	1	1
8. Individual consultation in Denver	2	0	0	0

From these tabulations one might conclude that the reactions to the various presentations of state assessment plans were quite consistent, with the following numbers rating them as "good" -- 22, 21, 19, 21, 23, 26, 22 (questions 1, 4, 5, and 6). However, percentages ranged from 50 to 72. In toto, the three separate presentations (Minnesota, New Jersey, and Michigan) were received a bit better than the four "combined" presentations. Perhaps of greater significance is the fact that the respondents reacted quite differently to different sessions. Only four respondents rated all the sessions as either good or average; everyone else cast a split ballot. This suggests that everyone felt that at least some of the state assessment sessions were good. In fact, only two respondents did not check at least one session as being good. So, different needs were being met.

The NAEP dinner program received a 50-50 reaction. But four respondents either double-checked that program as being outstanding or very good or added a footnote to that effect.

The only generally negative reaction was to the discussion of what's new in NAEP. One can only speculate as to whether there is a lack of interest in NAEP activities or whether the things that are new are not of great interest or whether too much time was devoted to it.

The small group discussion sessions were well received. Perhaps more time should be devoted to discussion sessions in the future.

* * * * *

Reactions to Length of Workshop

The question about balance of time and material resulted in 24 respondents saying that it was satisfactory; 9 saying that material should have been spread over more days; and 4 saying that less material should be covered in the same number of days. The co-directors had been concerned about "working" the participants too much. But only about a third of the respondents felt that the balance was unsatisfactory.

Some individual comments were made to that question. Six respondents suggested eliminating evening sessions; three suggested adding a day or two; two suggested that the schedule was OK; and two suggested fewer days but the same amount of material.

* * * *

Most and Least Liked Sessions

Two of the questions dealt with those things that were of most value and those of least value. There was considerable agreement on each question. Eighteen persons specifically mentioned things like "sharing ideas with others"; "interacting with others"; or "discussing problems of state assessment," as being most liked. Thirteen persons specifically mentioned that the most liked reaction was hearing about other state assessments. These two reactions were the overwhelming ones. No other single reaction was mentioned by more than two respondents each. The points that were mentioned by at least two persons were: (1) total impact of workshop; (2) sampling; (3) getting help from NAEP; and (4) the state plus contractor presentations.

The least liked program was "What's New in NAEP." Eighteen persons mentioned that one. Of the eighteen, seven pointed out that it was repetitious of things covered in Workshop I which they attended. Three other reactions were mentioned as least liked by more than one person. They were: (1) technical discussions; (2) too much detail; and (3) the dinner meeting.

These reactions confirm those from other years that tell us that state department assessment personnel want to know more about what is going on in other states and want to be able to share and discuss their own assessment questions and concerns.

* * * * *

Recommendation for Workshop for Others

Thirty-four of the respondents (90 percent) indicated that they would recommend a workshop of this nature for other state department personnel. This certainly suggested an overwhelming feeling of satisfaction with the total impact. Seventeen of the 34 said that their reason was because non-assessment personnel in state departments (curriculum specialists were most often mentioned) need to know more about assessment. Sixteen of the 34 indicated that they would recommend the workshop because they received a great deal from it themselves. Thus, respondents really reacted to this question quite differently -- some in relation to its suitability for non-assessors, some in relation to its suitability for assessors. In one sense, then, it turned out to be a double-barreled question, which is difficult to interpret except to conclude considerable satisfaction.

* * * *

When asked if they would recommend this workshop for LEA's, the responses were more mixed. Twenty-one said no, 13 said yes, and five said maybe. Of those who said no the most common reasons were: (1) it's the SEA's job to deal with LEA's, or (2) it doesn't apply to LEA's, or (3) too technical. Of those who said yes the most common reasons were: (1) LEA's need to know about assessment too, or (2) would recommend for large cities only.

* * * *

Suggestions for Improvement

Two of the questions were completely open-ended. One asked for suggestions for improving the meeting; one asked for "final comments," most of which were suggestions for improvements. So it seems appropriate to summarize those comments together. Certain points were repeated often enough (from three to eight times each) to warrant mentioning them.

One common response was "to continue with presentations of specific state plans" (seven responses). This suggestion reinforces the very positive responses that were received on questions relating to specific state assessment plans.

The small group discussion sessions were asked for again (five responses) with several respondents suggesting that more time be allowed for each session. The hour allocated was not felt to be sufficient, according to some comments.

Quite a few respondents (eight) suggested more "focused" sessions, in which a specific topic would be addressed in some depth -- perhaps a half day devoted to it (or more). Specific topic suggestions were "some subject area such as reading"; "what's new in various states or NAEP"; "new technology"; "assessing change."

Seven respondents suggested that the 50 states were different enough on some bases (size, geography, level of assessment "sophistication" or group vs. individual pupil data) to ask for breaking up the workshop. One type of suggestion was to move to mini-conferences or to regional conferences. Another type of suggestion was to offer more alternative sessions within an annual meeting.

Five respondents suggested the need for better organization of presentations and/or for better speakers. It was felt that some presenters had done a much better job of preparation than others.

Three persons called for more attention to the relationship of

assessment to instruction, of focusing on how assessment results can be used more effectively. Several suggested bringing more curriculum specialists from their own staffs to the meeting.

A great many comments were individual ones. They will not be listed here, but will be reviewed carefully in planning for future activities. One individual suggestion will be quoted however. It is "Fine each speaker 10¢ for each time he says, 'you know.' The fund would pay all refreshment costs."

* * * *

Best Time for 1974 Meeting

When asked to suggest the time for a similar meeting in 1974, the results were as follows:

May	5
June	4
July	9
August	4
October	1
Before June	1
Summer	1
After July 1	3

* * * *

Would You Like to Attend in 1974?

The most rewarding response, from the directors' point of view, was made to the last question. "Would you be interested in attending a follow-up workshop next summer?" Thirty-seven persons said yes, two persons said perhaps, and no one said no. This response leads directly to our first recommendation, below.

* * * *

Recommendations Based on the Evaluation

The directors' evaluation of the workshop evaluations has led us to the following conclusions:

1. National Assessment should sponsor a summer workshop (or conference) on large-scale assessment for state department personnel in 1974. Aside from the quality of the program, the fact that the meeting brings together state assessment workers is itself a most important contribution to the assessment movement.

2. The 1974 meeting should place considerable emphasis upon what is being done in state assessments.

3. The 1974 meeting should include more "discussion" sessions, with more time available for such sessions.

4. Efforts should be made to improve the "quality" of presentations, either by judicious selection of presenters or more specific directions, to the extent that this can be done. The directors do not feel, however, that an important topic, or a given state program should be eliminated from consideration because of an inability to guarantee a "stimulating" presentation.

5. Efforts should be made to focus on specific assessment "issues" of concern to a number of states, and not confine the efforts to things of interest to all states.

6. Efforts should be made to increase the "individualization" of the program by offering more choices rather than concentrating as much on total group sessions. This suggests a movement toward a "conference" format in contrast to a "workshop" format.

7. Consideration should be given to inviting a greater variety of state department personnel to at least some of the meetings next year, in particular, curriculum specialists. A conference format would lend itself to that possibility.

8. The six-month follow-up evaluation of workshop attendees should be focused on identifying specific program content that will be of maximum utility. Suggestions made in the recent evaluation should be used as one basis for developing the questionnaire.

* * * *

The directors are pleased with the evaluations of Workshop II, both because of indications of satisfaction but also because of the many specific suggestions for improvement.

WORKSHOP STAFF

DIRECTORS

Frank B. Womer
The University of Michigan

Irvin J. Lehmann
Michigan State University

NAEP STAFF

Assessment Workshop Coordinator
Jack Schmidt, State Assessment Consultant

Abbey, Janet, Secretary, Utilization/Applications
Brown, Rex, Report Coordinator, Utilization/Applications
Burton, Nancy, Area Development Monitor, Exercise Development
Crane, Robert, Report Writer, Utilization/Applications
Gadway, Charles, Writer Analyst, Research and Analysis
Hazlett, James, Director NAEP, and Director, Elementary and Secondary Education Services, ECS
Herman, Magdalen, Program Consultant, Utilization/Applications
Johnson, George, Associate Staff Director, Administration
Martin, Wayne, Analyst, Research and Analysis
Mughrabi, Linda, Secretary, Utilization/Applications
Mullis, Ina, Analyst, Research and Analysis
Newcomb, Scott, Area Development Monitor, Exercise Development
Oldefendt, Sue, Analyst, Research and Analysis
Phillips, Donald, Analyst, Research and Analysis
Pratt, Ted, Dissemination Coordinator, Utilization/Applications
Rogers, Todd, Sampling Coordinator, Research and Analysis
Salazar, Teresa, Program Consultant, Utilization/Applications
Seaman, Ken, Director, Utilization/Applications
Searls, Donald, Director, Research and Analysis
Sherman, Sue, Analyst, Research and Analysis
Talle, Roger, Director, Operations
Trussel, Vicky, Editor, NAEP Newsletter, Utilization/Applications
Vandermyn, Gaye, NAEP Public Information Officer, Communications Department/ECS
Wilson, Hal, Director, Exercise Development
Wright, David, Data Coordinator, Research and Analysis

* * * * *

SPEAKERS

Bettinghaus, Erwin, Professor of Communication, Michigan State University
Miller, Gerald, Professor of Communication, Michigan State University
Rubin, Louis, Professor of Communication, University of Illinois

* * * * *

STATE DEPARTMENT PRESENTERS

Adams, John, Director, Educational Assessment, Minnesota
Ascher, Gordon, Director, Educational Assessment, New Jersey
Carlson, Dale, Director, Statewide Assessment Programs, California
Cruse, Keith, Program Director, Needs Assessment, Texas
Fisher, James, Consultant, Division of Instruction, Maryland
Keiter, Roberta, Assistant Director for Test Administration, Montgomery County Public Schools, Rockville, Maryland
Impara, James, Administrator, Statewide Assessment, Florida
Schooley, Dan, Director of Test Development, Michigan
Shepard, Lorrie, Program Evaluation & Research, California

* * * * *

ASSESSMENT CONTRACTORS PRESENTERS

Bayless, David, Senior Educational Sampling Statistician, RTI
Pyecha, John, Senior Educational System Analyst, RTI
Finch, Fred, Manager, Custom Instrument Development, CTB/McGraw-Hill
Schabacker, William, Elementary and Secondary Programs, ETS

* * * * *

UNITED STATES OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Majors, Dexter, Program Officer, State Agency Cooperation Division
Song, Tongsoo, NCES, Office of Education

* * * * *

COOPERATIVE ACCOUNTABILITY PROJECT

Ludka, Art, Assistant Director
Olson, Arthur, Director

* * * * *

WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS

ALABAMA

Russell Chandler
Research Consultant
Office of Planning & Evaluation
412 State Office Building
Montgomery 36104

Frank T. Speed, Director
Departmental Services
Room 416, State Office Bldg.
Montgomery 36104
Phone: 205-269-7216

ARIZONA

Eugene Hertzke
Superintendent, Creighton District
2702 E. Flower Street
Phoenix 85016

CALIFORNIA

Dale Carlson, Director
Statewide Assessment Programs
Department of Education
721 Capitol Mall
Sacramento 95814

Lorrie Shepard, Consultant
Office of Program Evaluation
and Research
Department of Education
721 Capitol Mall
Sacramento 95814
Phone: 916-322-2200

COLORADO

John F. Haberbosch,
Senior Consultant, District
Planning Services
Department of Education
State Office Building
Denver 80203

John W. Helper, Consultant
Department of Education
Room 430, State Office Bldg.
Denver 80203
Phone: 303-892-2238

Jim Hennes
Planning & Evaluation Unit
Department of Education
State Office Building
Denver 80203
Phone: 303-892-2217

CONNECTICUT

Joseph J. Cashman
Educational Consultant
Bureau of Management & Finance
State Department of Education
PO Box 2215
Hartford 06115

George Kinkade
State Department of Education
State Capitol Building
Hartford 06115
Phone: 203-566-4382

FLORIDA

James C. Impara, Administrator
Department of Education
117 M.J. Suite 10
Tallahassee 32304

Tom Seals, Evaluation Consultant
Department of Education
Suite 10 M.J.
Tallahassee 32304

Gambhir M. Shrestha
Statistician, Evaluation Section
State Department of Education
Tallahassee 32304

GEORGIA

Peter Thomas, Consultant
Statewide Testing
State Office Building, Room 258
Atlanta 30334

HAWAII

Janet I. Sumida, Evaluator
State Department of Education
1270 Queen Emma Street
Honolulu 96813

KENTUCKY

William W. Field
Program Coordinator
LEA Title I Projects
Division Compensatory Education
Department of Education
Frankfort 40601

David W. Shannon, Head
Office of Planning & Evaluation
Department of Education
Frankfort 40601

Eugene Tallent, Coordinator
Planning and Evaluation
Bureau of Instruction
Department of Education
Frankfort 40601
Phone: 502-564-3233

Donald S. VanFleet, Director
Division of Evaluation
State Department of Education
Frankfort 40601
Phone: 502-564-4394

MAINE

Joseph Pecoraro
Educational Planner
Office of Planning, Evaluation,
and Research
State Department of Educational
and Cultural Services
Augusta 04330
Phone: 207-289-2373
207-289-2321

MARYLAND

Robert W. Armacost, Specialist
Office of Advanced Planning &
Development
Baltimore City Public Schools
2330 St. Paul Street
Baltimore 21218

James L. Fisher
Department of Education
PO Box 8717
Friendship International Airport
Baltimore 21240
Phone: 301-796-8300

M. Roberta Keiter
Assistant Director, MCPS
Dept. Pupil & Program Appraisal
850 North Washington
Rockville 20850
Phone: 301-279-3596

James Morgan
Montgomery County Public Schools
850 North Washington
Rockville 20850
Phone: 301-279-3595

MASSACHUSETTS

James F. Baker
Associate Commissioner
Department of Education
182 Tremont
Boston 02111
Phone: 617-727-8477

Steve Kaagan, Executive Planner
State Education Department
178 Tremont
Boston 02111
Phone: 617-727-5700

MICHIGAN

Thomas H. Fisher
Research Consultant
Educational Assessment Program
Department of Education
PO Box 420
Lansing 48902
Phone: 517-373-1830

Dan Schooley
Director of Test Development
Department of Education
PO Box 420
Lansing 48902
Phone: 517-373-1830

MINNESOTA

John W. Adams, Director
State Educational Assessment
Department of Education
731 Capitol Square Building
St. Paul 55101

Floyd Keller
Director of Instruction
Department of Education
550 Cedar
Capitol Square
St. Paul 55101
Phone: 612-296-4060

MISSOURI

John F. Allan, Chairman
Statewide Assessment Project
Director of Planning & Evaluation
Department of Education
Jefferson City 65101
Phone: 314-751-3501

MONTANA

J. Michael Pichette
Reporting Services Coordinator
Research, Planning, Development,
and Evaluation
Office of Superintendent of Public
Instruction
Helena 59601
Phone: 406-449-3693

NEVADA

R. H. Mathers, Consultant
Department of Education
Heroes Memorial Building
Carson City 89701
Phone: 702-882-7111

NEW JERSEY

Gordon Ascher, Director
Office of Educational Assessment
Department of Education
225 W. State Street
Trenton 08625
Phone: 609-292-7983

Joyce Matthews, Program Planner
Office of Assessment
Department of Education
225 W. State Street
Trenton 08625
Phone: 609-292-6939

NEW MEXICO

Alan D. Morgan, State Director
Evaluation and Assessment
Department of Education
Santa Fe 87501
Phone: 505-827-2928

NEW YORK

Alan Robertson, Director
Division of Education Evaluation
Office of Research, Communica-
tions, & Evaluation
State Department of Education
Albany 12224
Phone: 518-474-3236

NORTH CAROLINA

William J. Brown
Director of Research
State Department of Public Instruction
Raleigh 27602

Robert C. Evans, Director
Assessment and Evaluation Unit
Division of Research
State Department of Public Instruction
Raleigh 27611

OHIO

John Adams, Chief of Planning
Division of Planning & Evaluation
65 South Front Street
Columbus 43215

OREGON

R. B. Clemmer
Coordinator, Planning & Evaluation
Department of Education
943 Lancaster Drive, NE
Salem 97310
Phone: 503-378-3074

Robert H. Mattson
College of Education
University of Oregon
Eugene 97401
Phone: 503-686-3405

Charles Nelson
Evaluation Specialist
Planning and Evaluation
Department of Education
Salem 97310
Phone: 503-378-3074

PENNSYLVANIA

William W. Burson
Educational Research Associate
Division of Educational Quality Assessment
PO Box 911, DOE
Harrisburg 17109
Phone: 717-787-4234

Thomas E. Kendig, Chief
Division of Educational Quality Assessment
PO Box 911, DOE
Harrisburg 17126
Phone: 717-787-4234

RHODE ISLAND

Carol A. Kominski
Statewide Testing Consultant
Division of Research & Planning
State Department of Education
Rogers Williams Building
Providence 02808

SOUTH CAROLINA

W. D. Ellis, Director
Office of Research
Department of Education
Columbia 29201
Phone: 803-758-2169

Charles R. Statler
Head Supervisor
State Testing Program
Office of Research
Department of Education
Columbia 29201
Phone: 803-758-2301

SOUTH DAKOTA

Henry Kosters, Associate
Superintendent, Planning Division
Department of Public Instruction
Pierre 57501

TENNESSEE

Thomas G. Caulkins
Director of Evaluation
State Department of Education
263 Cordell Hull Building
Nashville 37219
Phone: 615-741-3206

John E. Cox
Assistant to the Commissioner
State Department of Education
142 Cordell Hull Building
Nashville 37219
Phone: 615-741-2927

John N. Hooker, Director
State Testing Services
1000 White Avenue
University of Tennessee
Knoxville 37916
Phone: 615-974-5385

Ross Mol, Director
Program Planning
State Testing Services
1000 White Avenue
University of Tennessee
Knoxville 37916
Phone: 615-974-5385

TEXAS

Keith L. Cruse
Program Director
Needs Assessment
Texas Education Agency
201 East Eleventh Street
Austin 78701

Ronald Knight
Office of Planning
Texas Education Agency
201 E. Eleventh Street
Austin 78701
Phone: 512-475-2066

VIRGINIA

James M. Bagby
Supervisor of Testing
State Department of Education
Richmond 23216
Phone: 804-770-2615

WASHINGTON

Gordon Ensign, Supervisor
Program Evaluation
State Superintendent of Public Instruction
Old Capitol Building
Olympia 98504
Phone: 206-753-3449

Robert C. Munson, Supervisor
Program Evaluation
State Superintendent of Public Instruction
Old Capitol Building
Olympia 98504
Phone: 206-753-3449

WEST VIRGINIA

Philip F. Thornton, Consultant
Assessment and Evaluation
Department of Education
Building 6B, Room 363
Charleston 25305
Phone: 304-348-2698

WISCONSIN

James H. Gold
Assessment Coordinator
Research, Assessment, Evaluation
Department of Public Instruction
126 Langdon
Madison 53702
Phone: 608-266-7941

Robert H. Gomoll, Section Chief
Research, Assessment, Evaluation
Department of Public Instruction
126 Langdon
Madison 53702
Phone: 608-266-1782

WYOMING

Peggy A. Bagby
Assistant Director, WYENAP
College of Education
University of Wyoming
Laramie 82070

PUERTO RICO

Martin Alvarado Martinez
Department of Education
Hato Rey, Puerto Rico 00919
Phone: 765-9350

VIRGIN ISLANDS

Kurt Komives
Evaluation Specialist
ESEA, Title III
Department of Education
PO Box 630
St. Thomas 00801

OTHER PARTICIPANTS

Joane Binkley
ERIC Clearinghouse on Social
Studies Education
855 Broadway
Boulder, Colorado 80302

Robert Fox
ERIC Clearninghouse on Social
Studies Education
855 Broadway
Boulder, Colorado 80302

George Heigho, Project Director
Guidance Programs Laboratory
Science Research Associates
259 East Erie
Chicago, Illinois 60611
Phone: 312-944-7552, ext. 187

Bernard H. McKenna
Professional Associate
Instruction & Professional Development
National Education Association
1201 Sixteenth, NW, Room 715
Washington, D.C. 20036

John O'Neill, Manager
Measurement Research Center
PO Box 30
Iowa City, Iowa 52240
Phone: 319-356-3234

Barbara Sizemore
Associate Secretary
American Association of School
Administrators
1801 N. Moore
Arlington, Virginia 22209
Phone: 703-528-0700

Lyman J. Smith, Director
Assessment Operations
Science Research Associates
259 East Erie
Chicago, Illinois 60611

1973 ASSESSMENT WORKSHOP
EVALUATION FOR WORKSHOPS I AND III*

June 1973 Boulder, Colorado

The purpose of this evaluation is to determine the impact of your experience here in relation to your local assessment needs. Because of a possible follow-up, we request that you identify yourself so that we can collate the results of the two evaluations. All information will be kept confidential. Only group results will be reported. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

1. Name of participant: _____

2. State: _____

3. Listed below are the eight major topical areas of this workshop. Please rank them in descending order of importance to you in the performance of your present and (possible) future work. (Use "1" for most important.)

( ) Development of Objectives ( ) Exercise Development

( ) Sampling ( ) Data Collection

( ) Scoring ( ) Data Analysis

( ) Report Preparation ( ) Dissemination

4. What are your general impressions of the value to you of the following:

a. Overall workshop organization	___good	___average	___poor
b. Workshop content	___good	___average	___poor
c. Speakers/discussion leaders	___good	___average	___poor
d. Workshop materials	___good	___average	___poor
e. Living facilities	___good	___average	___poor
f. Opportunity for group discussion	___good	___average	___poor
g. Opportunity to interact individually with other conference participants	___good	___average	___poor
h. Availability of workshop co-directors	___good	___average	___poor

Comments: _____

5. The workshop this year is very condensed; a great deal of material is covered in a very short time, including evenings. Please give us your evaluation of this concern.

( ) The amount of material and period of time was satisfactory.

( ) The amount of material was OK, but should have been spread over more days.

( ) The number of days was OK, but less material should be covered.

Comments: _____

*This version is condensed slightly by reducing the space available for writing comments.

6. What improvements would you recommend for future workshops (content, speakers, facilities, organization, length, etc.)?

_____

7. What was of MOST value to you in this workshop? Why?

_____

8. What was of LEAST value to you in this workshop? Why?

_____

9. Would you recommend this workshop for other State Department personnel? _____Yes ____No Why/Why Not?_____

_____

10. Would you recommend this workshop for LEA's?
_____Yes _____No Why/Why Not?__ _____

_____

11. Final Comments (please give us your suggestions for improvements or for new or different workshops):

_____

12. Would you be interested in attending a follow-up workshop on national and state assessments next summer?

____Yes ____No

1973 ASSESSMENT WORKSHOP
EVALUATION FOR WORKSHOP II*

June 1973 Boulder, Colorado

The purpose of this evaluation is to determine the impact of your experience here in relation to your local assessment needs. Because of a possible follow-up, we request that you identify yourself so that we can collate the results of the two evaluations. All information will be kept confidential. Only group results will be reported. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

1. Name of participant: _____

2. State: _____

3. What are your general impressions of the value to you of the following:

a. Overall workshop organization	___good	___average	___poor
b. Workshop content	___good	___average	___poor
c. Speakers	___good	___average	___poor
d. Workshop materials	___good	___average	___poor
e. Living facilities	___good	___average	___poor
f. Opportunity to interact individually with other conference participants	___good	___average	___poor
g. Availability of NAEP staff	___good	___average	___poor
h. Availability of workshop co-directors	___good	___average	___poor

Comments: _____

4. What are your general impressions of the value to you of the following specific sessions:

4.1 Four state part discussion (California, Florida, Maryland, Texas)

a. Purposes, objectives, exercises	___good	___average	___poor
b. Sampling and data collection	___good	___average	___poor
c. Analysis and report writing	___good	___average	___poor
d. Dissemination	___good	___average	___poor
4.2 National Assessment dinner program	___good	___average	___poor
4.3 What's New at NAEP	___good	___average	___poor
4.4 Minnesota assessment	___good	___average	___poor
4.5 New Jersey assessment	___good	___average	___poor
4.6 Michigan assessment	___good	___average	___poor
4.7 Small group discussions	___good	___average	___poor
4.8 Individual consultation in Denver (omit if not applicable)	___good	___average	___poor

*This version is condensed slightly by reducing the space available for writing comments.

5. The workshop this year is very condensed; a great deal of material is covered in a very short time, including evenings. Please give us your evaluation of this concern.

   ( ) The amount of material and period of time was satisfactory.

   ( ) The amount of material was OK, but should have been spread over more days.

   ( ) The number of days was OK, but less material should be covered.

   Comments: _____

6. What improvements would you recommend for future workshops (content, speakers, facilities, organization, length, etc.)?

   _____

7. What was of MOST value to you in this workshop? Why?

   _____

8. What was of LEAST value to you in this workshop? Why?

   _____

9. Would you recommend this workshop for other State Department personnel? ____Yes ___No Why/Why Not? _____

   _____

10. Would you recommend this workshop for LEA's?

    ____Yes ____No Why/Why Not? _____

    _____

11. Final Comments (please give us your suggestions for improvements or for new or different workshops):

    _____

12. Would you be interested in attending a follow-up workshop on national and state assessments next summer?

    ____Yes ____No

The Education Commission of the States is a nonprofit organization formed by interstate compact in 1966. Forty-seven states and territories are now members. Its goal is to further a working relationship among state governors, legislators and educators for the improvement of education. This report is an outcome of one of many Commission undertakings at all levels of education. The Commission offices are located at 300 Lincoln Tower, 1860 Lincoln Street, Denver, Colorado 80203.